

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated July 11, 2008 (the “Office Action”).

Claims 38-70, 111, 113-124, 126-137, 139-150, 152-163, 165-177, 179-191, 193-205, and 207-221 are pending in the application, including new claims 219-221.

Claims 38-53, 55-70, 111, 118, 124, 131, 137, 144, 150, 157, 163, 165-168, 177, 179-182, 191, 193-196, 205, and 207-210 stand rejected.

Claims 54, 113-117, 119-123, 126-130, 132-136, 139-143, 145-149, 152-156, 158-162, 169-176, 183-190, 197-204, and 211-218 are under objection.

The amendments add no new matter. Support for the amendments may be found throughout Applicant’s Specification and Drawings as originally filed, for example in FIG. 4 and in the discussion on p. 20, line 26—p. 21, line 11. While not conceding that the cited references qualify as prior art, but instead to expedite prosecution, Applicant has chosen to respond as follows. Applicant reserves the right, for example in a continuing application, to establish that the cited references, or other references cited thus far or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable in view of the following remarks and the above amendments, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending rejections.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant is grateful for the indication that that objected claims 113-117, 119-123, 126-130, 132-136, 139-143, 145-149, 152-156, 158-162, 169-176, 183-190, 197-204, and 211-218 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant wishes to maintain these claims in dependent form in view of the following remarks regarding the corresponding base claims.

Applicant has amended claims 113, 119, 126, 132, 139, 145, 152, and 158. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims continue to present allowable subject matter.

Formal matters

Applicant requests clarification of the status of the claims and the grounds for the pending rejections and objections.

Claim 54: clarification requested.

The Office Action indicates that Claim 54 under objection. *See, Office Action Summary, p. 2.* However, the Office Action does not appear to describe the reason for the objection to claim 54. Applicant notes that in the previous Office Action, claim 54 was described as presenting allowable subject matter.

Applicant requests an explanation of the reason for the objection to claim 54. If the previous indication of allowability has been withdrawn, then Applicant respectfully notes that any new grounds for rejection must be presented in a subsequent non-final Office action, in accordance with MPEP § 706.07(a), since the new grounds of rejection are not being

necessitated by an amendment of the claims by Applicant, or by a suitable Information Disclosure Statement.

Claims 40 and 52: clarification requested.

On p. 2, the Office Action indicates that claims 40 and 52 are among the claims rejected over Spiegel in view of Perlman. However, the ensuing discussions of the Spiegel-Perlman combination do not appear to address the limitations claims 40 or 52.

However, on p. 4, the Office Action states that claim 40 stands rejected over Spiegel in view of Perlman and further in view of Chou. On p. 6, the Office Action states that claim 52 stands rejected over Spiegel in view of Perlman and further in view of Bare. Applicant requests clarification on the grounds of rejection of claims 40 and 52.

Claims 118, 131, 144, and 157: clarification requested.

The Office Action is not clear about the grounds of rejection for claims 118, 131, 144, and 157. On p. 9 of the Office Action, these claims are listed among the claims rejected under § 103(a) over Spiegel and Fukushima, but the Office Action does not appear to discuss these claims with regard to this combination of references. The Office Action includes a conflicting indication on p. 8, which lists some of these claims as being rejected under § 102(e) over Fukushima.

Applicant requests clarification on the grounds of rejection of claims 118, 131, 144, and 157. The arguments regarding these claims in the Office Action appear to rely only on material passages cited from Fukushima. *See*, Office Action, pp. 8-10.

Claims 169-176, 183-190, 197-204, and 211-218: clarification requested.

On p. 10, the Office Action indicates that claims 169-176, 183-190, 197-204, and 211-218 are among the claims rejected over Spiegel in view of Fukushima. However, the discussions of the Spiegel-Fukushima combination do not appear to address the limitations of these claims.

Moreover, the Office Action states on p. 11 that these claims present allowable subject matter. Applicant requests clarification on the status of claims 169-176, 183-190, 197-204, and 211-218.

If the indication of allowability on p. 11 is incorrect, then Applicant respectfully notes that any new grounds for rejection must be presented in a subsequent non-final Office action, in accordance with MPEP § 706.07(a), since the new grounds of rejection are not being necessitated by an amendment of the claims by Applicant, or by a suitable Information Disclosure Statement.

Rejections under § 112, sixth paragraph

Claims 205 and 207-218 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. The Office Action appears to express a concern that purportedly “no function is specified by the word(s) preceding ‘means’ ” in these claims, and cites *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 U.S.P.Q. 694 (Bd. App. 1967).

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending rejection is inapposite to the pending claims. In particular, it is not clear what the Examiner intends by “the word(s) preceding ‘means’ ” in these claims the word “means” in these claims, because the claims language in question sets forth limitations that begin with the word “means.” Where Applicant’s claims use the word “means,” that word is followed by appropriate language. For example, claim 205 includes “means for receiving a hello packet at a downstream node,” and “means for sending an acknowledgement from said downstream node.”

To the extent that § 112, sixth paragraph is applicable to the present application, it does not require that any functional language “precede” the word means. For example, the *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (Ed. 8, Rev. 7, Jul. 2008) (“MPEP”) makes clear in an example that claim language of “printing means” and “means for printing” would have the same connotations. *See*, MPEP, § 2181(I) (citing *Klumb*).

Title 35 of the *United States Code*, § 112, sixth paragraph states:

An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof.

(Emphasis added.)

Applicant respectfully submits that the requirements of § 112, sixth paragraph do not render any of Applicant's claims invalid. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that any words that precede the word "means" are not inappropriate in claims 205 and 207-218.

Applicant believes that the Examiner may have intended the pending rejection under to be a rejection under § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable under § 112, second paragraph. As set forth in the MPEP:

It is necessary for the words which precede "means" to convey a function to be performed. For example, the phrase "latch means" is definite because the word "latch" conveys the function "latching."

MPEP, § 706.03(d), Examiner Note to Form paragraph 7.34.11 (which also cites *Klumb*).

However, the same passage of the MPEP goes on to make clear that the functional language need not precede the word "means," but instead may follow this word in appropriate form:

In general, if the phrase can be restated as "means for ____," and it still makes sense, it is definite.

Id.

In this case, the language in question (e.g., "means for receiving a hello packet at a downstream node," and "means for sending an acknowledgement from said downstream node" in claim 205) makes sense, and is definite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 205 and 207-218 are patentable under § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections under § 102(e) over Fukushima

Claims 111, 124, 131, 137, 144, 150, 157, 163, 177, 191, and 205 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,246 issued to Fukushima et al. (“Fukushima”). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable because the cited portions of the Fukushima fail to disclose each limitation of Applicant’s claims.

Independent claims 111, 124, 137, and 150.

For example, independent claim 111 recites:

111. A method of processing a get link state advertisement packet comprising:
receiving said get link state advertisement packet at a downstream node, wherein
 said get link state advertisement packet is sent by a sending node,
 said get link state advertisement packet comprises at least one node identifier,
 said at least one node identifier identifies a node in a network for which said sending node seeks a link state advertisement, and
 said downstream node and said sending node are nodes in said network;
sending at least one link state advertisement from said downstream node to said sending node; and
receiving an acknowledgement of said at least one link state advertisement at said downstream node.

(Emphasis added.)

The cited portions of Fukushima do not disclose, or fairly suggest, that at least one node identifier identifies a node for which a sending node “seeks” a link state advertisement. With regard to this limitation, the Office Action on p. 8 cites portions of the following passages of Fukushima:

Meanwhile, each router, while it transmits or receives Hello packets and network link-state information, manages the states of other routers on the network to which this router is connected and also manages the states of the interfaces through which this router is connected to networks. With regard to the states of routers, each router manages the routers’ ID’s, and checks if each of those routers is aware of this router, or checks if each of those routers has completed the transmission and reception of network link-state information. With regard to interface state, each router manages the addresses of the interfaces and other routers connected to a network to which an interface is connected.

A list of other routers, which is included in a Hello packet, is prepared according to the states of routers and the states of interfaces mentioned above.

Each router monitors the active modes of the other routers according to information from Hello packets it receives. More specifically, if there is any other router from which the router has not received Hello packets for longer than a fixed period, the router decides that a failure has occurred in this other router.

Fukushima, 2:10-32.

This passage from Fukushima teaches that each router checks if each other router on the network, to which the router is connected, is aware of the router, or checks if each of those routers has completed the transmission and reception of network link-state information.

However, these teachings fall short of disclosing the limitations of Applicant’s claim 111. In particular, there is no indication in Fukushima that the Hello packet identifies a node for which a sending node seeks a link state advertisement.

As set forth on p. 17 of Applicant's originally filed Specification, one implementation of a link state advertisement describes the state of a node's links. For example, the link state advertisement may contain "a list of the node's neighbors, links, the capacity of those links, the quality of service available on over links, one or more costs associated with each of the links, and other pertinent information."

Even if the Fukushima system employs a link state advertisement (and Applicant does not concede this point), the cited passages do not disclose that a node seeks a link state advertisement from a particular other node through the cited Hello packets (or through any other packets). More particularly, the cited material does not teach that the Fukushima Hello packets (or any other packets) are employed by a sending node that "seeks" a link state advertisement from another node. And further, the cited material certainly does not teach that the Hello packets (or any other packets) identify the node "for which said sending node seeks a link state advertisement." These limitations are therefore absent from Fukushima.

At least for these reasons, independent claim 111 and all claims dependent therefrom are allowable under § 102(e). At least for similar reasons, independent claims 124, 137, and 150, and all claims dependent therefrom are also all allowable under § 102(e).

Independent claims 163, 177, 191, and 205.

As another example, independent claim 163 recites:

163. A method comprising:

receiving a hello packet at a downstream node, wherein said hello packet comprises a link state advertisement;

processing said link state advertisement, wherein processing said link state advertisement includes sending said link state advertisement from said downstream node; and
sending an acknowledgement from said downstream node, wherein said acknowledgement acknowledges all link state advertisements in said hello packet.

(Emphasis added.)

Claim 163 includes receiving a hello packet at a downstream node. The received hello packet includes a link state advertisement. Claim 163 also includes limitations of processing said link state advertisement, which includes sending the link state advertisement “from said downstream node.” Claim 163 also includes sending an acknowledgement “from said downstream node.” With regard to these limitations, the Office Action cites features of FIG. 8 and the portions of following passages from Fukushima:

The RP packet transmission-reception module 14, when it is started, transmits routing protocol packets, such as Hello packets, onto the networks directly connected to the multiplex router 10, and receives routing protocol packets from other routers (step 121). If a received packet has come from a neighboring router, the module 14 checks whether the presence of which has been or has not been recognized (step 122). If the presence of which has not been recognized, the module 14 notifies the protocol information manager module 15 of the newly-detected neighboring router (step 123). If the presence of which has been recognized (step 124), the module 14 sends this network link-state information to the protocol information manager module 15 (step 125).

FIG. 9 shows the procedure of the process steps of the protocol information manager module 15 in the route calculation unit 11 in the active mode.

In this process, the protocol information manager module 15 receives information from the RP packet transmission-reception module 14, and checks if information received is network link-state information (step 131). If the information is not network link-state information, in other words, if the information is about a neighboring router, the module 15 generates neighboring router state 24 and interface state 23 from information received (step 132). On the other hand, if the information is network link-state information, the module 15 checks if the information received agrees with the contents of the link-state data base 22 (step 133).

Fukushima, 10:19-46.

The Office Action appears to equate Applicant's link state advertisement with Fukushima's routing protocol packet, and to equate Applicant's downstream node with Fukushima's multiplex router 10. Even if this characterization of Fukushima is correct (and Applicant does not concede this point), the cited portions of the references fail to disclose each limitation of claim 163.

The above-quoted portions of Fukushima, and the accompanying features in the figures, teach that a multiplex router 10 can transmit routing protocol packets, such as Hello packets, onto the networks directly connected to the multiplex router 10, and can receive routing protocol packets from other routers. However, these passages do not describe any other transmission between routers. The material on which the Examiner relies is merely a description of messages within a particular router: the cited teachings only discuss various communications within multiplex router 10. For example, transmission-reception module 14 notifies protocol information manager module 15 of a newly-detected router. Module 14 also sends network link-state information to module 15. However, reference to Fukushima's FIG. 1 and 2 clearly show that these latter communications are wholly within multiplex router 10, which the Office Action equates with Applicant's downstream node. Thus, these cited communications could not, and

would not, be seen by a person having ordinary skill in the art as being communications “from” Applicant’s downstream node. Accordingly, they do not meet Applicant’s limitations of “sending said link state advertisement from said downstream node” and “sending an acknowledgement from said downstream node.”

At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 163 and all claims dependent therefrom are allowable under § 103(a). At least for similar reasons, independent claims 177, 191, and 205 and all claims dependent therefrom are also allowable under § 102(e).

Rejections under § 103(a) over Spiegel and Fukushima

Claims 118, 131, 144, 157, 165-176, 179-190, 193-204, and 207-218 stand rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Spiegel in view of Fukushima. *See*, Office Action, p. 9, lines 12-14, and p. 10, lines 16-18. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable because a person having ordinary skill in the art would not make the proposed combination of references, and further because the cited portions of the references, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose each limitation of Applicant's claims.

For example, claim 118 depends on claim 111. Thus, the above discussion regarding independent claim 111 and the relevant shortcomings of Fukushima apply with full force to support the patentability of dependent claim 118. The Office Action explicitly does not rely on Spiegel to support the rejection of claim 118. *See*, Office Action, p. 10. Indeed, the cited portions of Spiegel fail to remedy the shortcomings of the cited portions of Fukushima with regard to claim 111, whether these references are considered individually or in combination.

Accordingly, claim 118 is allowable under § 103(a). At least for similar reasons, claims 131, 144, 157, 165-176, 179-190, 193-204, and 207-218 are also allowable under § 103(a).

Rejections under § 103(a) over art including Spiegel and Perlman

Claims 38-52 and 55-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,649,108 issued to Spiegel et al. (“Spiegel”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,455,865 issued to Perlman (“Perlman”). Claims 53 and 69-70¹ stand rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable under § 103(a) over Spiegel in view of Perlman and Fukushima.

In addition, the Office Action also asserts the following additional rejections for some of the above-noted claims.

Claims 40 and 47 stand rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Spiegel in view of Perlman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,850,526 issued to Chou (“Chou”). Claims 43 and 44 stand rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Spiegel in view of Perlman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,197,127 issued to Waclawsky et al. (“Waclawsky”). Claims 42 and 46 stand rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Spiegel in view of Perlman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,086 issued to Martin et al. (“Martin”). Claims 52 stands rejected under § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Spiegel in view of Perlman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,865,160 issued to Bare (“Bare”).

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable because a person having ordinary skill in the art would not make the proposed combination of references, and further

¹ The Office Action does not explicitly cite Perlman with regard to the claims 53 and 69-70. On p. 9, the Office Action indicates that the rejection of claims 53 and 69-70 relies only on a combination of Spiegel and Fukushima. However, claims 53 and 69-70 depend on independent claim 38, which stands rejected over Spiegel and Perlman. Thus, Applicant understands the rejection of claims 53 and 69-70 to be based on a combination of Spiegel, Perlman, and Fukushima.

because the cited portions of the references, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose each limitation of Applicant's claims.

For example, independent claim 38 recites:

38. A method comprising:

transmitting a protocol packet from an origin node to a target node, wherein

said protocol packet is broadcast to a plurality of neighbors of said origin node to find said target node,

said protocol packet is configured to record a protocol packet path history from said origin node to said target node, and

said protocol packet path history comprises information regarding a topology of at least a portion of said network.

(Emphasis added.)

The Office Action notes on p. 3 that Spiegel does not disclose the transmission of a protocol packet that is broadcast "to a plurality of neighbors of said origin node" to find said target node. Perlman also fails to disclose or fairly suggest these limitations.

Perlman discusses the concept of "flooding" to broadcast packets over a network:

Broadcasting consists of sending a packet to every node on the network.

One method of broadcasting packets over the network is called flooding. Flooding requires each node which receives a packet to transmit it to each of its neighboring nodes, except the node from which it was received. Copies of the packet eventually travel throughout the network to every node over every communication link. Typically multiple copies of the packet reach every node.

Perlman, 1:43-52.

However, Perlman notes that broadcasting is an alternative to a more direct communication between nodes. "Packets may be transmitted from a given source node to a given destination node either by broadcasting the packet over the entire network or by routing

the packet along a specific group of nodes connecting the source to the destination.” *Id.* at 1:39-

43. Perlman describes an alternative to broadcasting, called “path specific routing”:

Alternatively, a packet may be sent to a destination node via a single route. Typically the source node launches a packet to a destination node by providing a neighbor node with the packet and with information regarding its destination. The neighbor, and each subsequent node which receives the packet, makes an independent decision as to the next node to which the packet should be forwarded in order to reach the destination specified by the source.

Perlman, 1:53-60.

Perlman further notes that path specific routing has advantages over broadcast flooding:

Such routing (called path specific routing) is less costly than flooding because it avoids redundant transmissions; but if a single node along the specified path fails to forward the packet, the destination node will not receive it. In flooding, conversely, individual node failures will not prevent delivery of a packet as long as a complete functioning path connects the source and destination.

Perlman, 1:61-67.

Perlman’s alternative to broadcast flooding—the “path specific routing”—is similar to the technique that is used by Spiegel, the other reference cited in the Office Action. Spiegel describes detailed tools for deciding in advance on a “source route” that should be taken by a packet through a network:

All source nodes and all intermediate nodes capable of rerouting use their maps of the network topology to compute routing tables, which list one or more source routes for every possible destination address. The routing tables are used to choose source routes for connection setup packets, based on the destination address and QOS (quality of service) classes.

Spiegel, 1:47-53.

Perlman's broadcasting—which transmits multiple redundant packets from one node through a parallel set of paths throughout a network to a destination node—would be an awkward, wasteful, and counterintuitive technique for use in Spiegel's system. Spiegel takes significant pains and uses elaborate tools to enable the use of source routing—which uses a single predetermined path for communication between two nodes. For example, Spiegel employs maps of network topology, as described in the above-quoted passage, and stores these maps in various nodes in order to compute routing tables with source routes for the various possible destination addresses. Spiegel specifically uses these routing tables to choose the source routes for connection setup packets. *Id.* at 1:50-53. The chosen source route for a connection setup packet is written into source route field 33 of the packet. *Id.* at 7:4-10.

A person having ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that the purpose of choosing source routes in Spiegel is to avoid the unnecessary and wasteful flooding of packets throughout a network that the broadcast of such packets represents. Spiegel uses a directed transmission of its connection setup packets to steer clear of the broadcast flooding that is described in Perlman. The advantage of this approach is even recognized by Perlman, which notes that “path specific routing[] is less costly than flooding because it avoids redundant transmissions” Perlman, 1:61-62.

The proposed modification of Spiegel with the broadcasting of Perlman would eliminate the need for the detailed procedures teachings for source routing that are described in Spiegel. This modification would not only hinder the operation of Spiegel, but would eviscerate the need for these detailed teachings of Spiegel.

Indeed, a person having ordinary skill in the art would understand that the detailed operations of evaluating possible source routes one after another in Spiegel would be

meaningless and useless if Spiegel instead used Perlman's simultaneous broadcast "to every node on the network" (Perlman, 1:43-44). Spiegel teaches and sets forth a detailed procedure by which possible paths through a network are evaluated one at a time to determine if they are adequate. Upon failure of a particular path to provide a desired connection in Spiegel, a new packet may later be generated and transmitted along a new recommended path. *See, e.g.*, Spiegel, 11:55—12:17.

This detailed procedure, which is elaborated in columns 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 (among others) and in FIGs. 7A-7D (among others) of Spiegel, would be unnecessary if Spiegel were to broadcast connection setup packets. With the broadcasting, all of Spiegel's routes would be evaluated concurrently, and there would be no need for the deliberate one-after-another evaluation procedures. A person having ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that Spiegel teaches and uses these elaborate evaluation procedures intentionally, and therefore wishes to avoid a broadcast technique. As mentioned above, one reason for avoiding such a broadcast technique is recognized in Perlman: flooding a network with packets is more costly because it relies on redundant transmissions.

Whatever the reason for avoiding the broadcast flooding, it is clear that Spiegel's tools are used in an environment that does avoid this flooding because Spiegel's teachings are neither needed nor helpful in an environment where a broadcast flooding would concurrently evaluate multiple possible routes.

A person having ordinary skill in the art using the teachings of Spiegel would do so with a deliberate goal of avoiding flooding. This skilled person would therefore not make the proposed modification of using Perlman's broadcast flooding, since doing so would cause the system to fail this goal.

At least for these reasons, claim 38 and all claims dependent therefrom are allowable under § 103(a).

Dependent claim 69.

In addition, the Office Action asserts Official notice of certain features of Applicant's claim 69 as purportedly being "well-known." Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings in question are not sufficiently well known for the application of Official Notice.

In particular, Applicant disagrees with the assertion on pp. 9-10 of the Office Action that:

it is well-known skill in the art that when a link or router is down, a protocol packet such as a link down packet is transmitted to the sender router to notify that the router has been down.

Applicant respectfully submits that that which the Office Action asserts to be well-known is not. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection that relies on this assertion of "well-known" features is ungrounded. (If it is the Examiner's position that the rejection is based on a personal knowledge that these limitations are well-known, Applicant requests that the facts be supported by an affidavit from the Examiner in accordance with MPEP § 2144.03(C) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2).) Applicant's claim 69 is therefore additionally patentable under § 103(a).

New claims

New claims 219 and 220 depend on independent claim 111, discussed above. New claim 221 depends on independent claim 163, discussed above. New claims 219-221 are therefore allowable at least for the reasons discussed above.

New claim 219 also includes limitations of "building a first list from a link state database maintained at said downstream node" (previously presented in allowed claim 113). Claim 219 is additionally allowable at least for this reason.

New claim 220 also includes limitations of "receiving said at least one link state advertisement from a node other than said sending node." Claim 220 is additionally allowable at least for this reason.

New claim 221 also includes limitations of:

determining if said link state advertisement is more recent than a link state advertisement corresponding to said entry in said link state database; and
only if said link state advertisement is more recent than said link state advertisement corresponding to said entry in said link state database, adding said link state advertisement to said link state database,

which are related to limitations previously presented in allowed claims 169 and 171. Claim 221 is additionally allowable at least for this reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5097.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, on October 14, 2008.



Attorney for Applicant



10/14/08
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Cyrus F. Bharucha
Attorney for Appellant
Reg. No. 42,324
Telephone: (512) 439-5097
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099